

**TEXT FLY WITHIN
THE BOOK ONLY**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164013

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 181.4 / 553 Ri. Accession No. 13431

Author Shastri, Mangal. D.

Title Rg. Veda Pratirakhyā Uvātā. 14

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE
RG-VEDA PRĀTIŚĀKHYA
WITH
THE COMMENTARY OF UVATA

EDITED FROM THE MANUSCRIPTS, WITH INTRODUCTION,
CRITICAL AND ADDITIONAL NOTES, ENGLISH TRANS-
LATION OF THE TEXT, AND SEVERAL APPENDICES

BY

MANGAL DEVA SHASTRI

M.A. (PANJ.), D.PHIL. (OXON.)

PART OF THE INTRODUCTION

HUMPHREY MILFORD

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW COPENHAGEN

NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE CAPE TOWN

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS SHANGHAI

1922

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY FREDERICK HALL

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The MS. Material	5
The Authorship of the Commentary on the Introductory Stanzas	8
The Pārṣada-Vṛtti	12
The Relation of Viṣṇumitra and Uvaṭa	15
The Style, Metre and Grammar of the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya .	17
The Text of the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya	26
The Text of the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya according to the Com- mentary of Uvaṭa	26
Lack of Unity in the Authorship of the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya .	29

To these text and commentary MSS. which I have directly collated myself may be added those which were, directly or indirectly, used by Regnier and M. Müller.

MSS. used by Regnier.

- (1) (2) The Berlin MSS. Nos. 595 and 691 (Chambers Collection). Two text MSS. Not directly collated by Regnier; cp. Reg., part I, p. 4. M. Müller also refers to these MSS. a few times. Cp. Weber's Catalogue of Berlin MSS., vol. i, p. 7.
- (3) The Whitney MS. A text MS. used by Regnier for the last few *paṭalas*; cp. Reg., part III, p. 2 (note).
- (4) MS. 203 (Devanāgarī) belonging to the Imperial Library at Paris. A commentary MS. which was mainly used by Regnier for his text as well as for the extensive extracts from Uvaṭa's commentary. It is described by Roth in *Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda* on p. 53.
- (5) The Berlin MS. No. 394 (Chambers Collection). A commentary MS. used by Regnier for the last few *paṭalas*; cp. Reg., part III, p. 2 (note), also part II, p. 57. Cp. Weber's Catalogue, vol. i, p. 8.

MSS. used by M. Müller.

- (1) A. A text MS.
- (2) a. A commentary MS. M. Müller refers to the text of the same MS. as 'at'.

The other four MSS. B, b, by, and h which were used by M. Müller are respectively identical with my MSS. I¹, I², B², and B³.

I should also mention two other sources from which I have derived some help in the constitution of the text of the Commentary: (1) the Benares edition of the Ṛg-Vedaprātisākhya together with the commentary of Uvaṭa (called by me B^a), and (2) *A Comparative Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, by A. Borooah, vol. x, Prosody, Calcutta, 1882. The former, though not a critical edition, has been helpful in determining the relation of the commentary MSS., and in some places, also in arriving at the proper reading. The latter quotes almost the whole of the last three *paṭalas* of the Ṛg-Vedaprātisākhya and also gives some extracts from a MS. of Uvaṭa's commentary, which he calls B on p. ix. In my critical notes I have a few times referred to Borooah for the variants found in these extracts.

Finally, I should mention a few other MSS. which I have consulted here and there and which are referred to by me in the Introduction (see below) and Notes, and in a few cases also in the foot-notes.

- (1) P = No. 56 in the *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of MSS. deposited at the Deccan College, Poona, Bombay, 1916*, vol. i, Part I. The MS., though ascribed to Viṣṇumitra at the end and though described as (sic) प्राति वृत्ति along the margin, is the same as that of Uvaṭa's commentary, whose name often occurs at the end of several other *paṭalas*. It also contains the commentary on the introductory stanzas. It is dated Śake, 1562 (= A.D. 1640).¹
- (2) P¹ = No. 460 of the same catalogue. A MS. of the Pārṣada-Vṛtti.
- (3) P² = No. 459 of the same catalogue. A MS. of the Pārṣada-Vṛtti. It is dated Samvat 1626 (A.D. 1569).
- (4) P³ = No. 55 of the same catalogue. A MS. of the Pārṣada-Vṛtti, not of the Bhāṣya as wrongly stated in the catalogue. It ends in the middle of the commentary on II. 29. These four MSS., now transferred from the Deccan College, Poona, to the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, were received by me only after I had almost finished the constitution of the text as well as of the commentary.
- (5) W¹ = Whish 73 (2) of the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society, London. A MS. of the Pārṣada-Vṛtti on palm-leaves and in Grantha characters: For a description of the MS., cp. M. Müller's *Rg. Prāt.*, Introduction, pp. 22-32.

Some further details about these MSS. are given below in the Introduction. The relation of Uvaṭa's commentary to the Pārṣada-Vṛtti is also discussed below. As will appear from that discussion, the commentary of Uvaṭa, excepting the first few *paṭalas*, being almost identical with the Pārṣada-Vṛtti, the MSS. of the latter have been of some help in ascertaining, in some places, the text of the former. In one or two cases, I have adopted the correct reading from P¹, the corresponding reading in the MSS. of Uvaṭa's commentary being obviously wrong.

Thus the evidence of altogether fourteen text MSS., seven MSS. of Uvaṭa's commentary, (if Bⁿ and Borooah represent each one MS., two more may be added) and four of the Pārṣada-Vṛtti has been partially or wholly utilized for the present edition.²

¹ The end-colophon in P reads: (sic) इति श्रीदेवमित्राचार्यपुत्रश्रीकुमाचरविष्णुमित्राचार्यविरचितायां ऋज्वर्थायां पार्षदव्याख्यायां अष्टादशपटलं समाप्तं । शके १५६२ समये मणेशकवीश्वरेण लिखितं ॥

² Two sections of the Introduction giving a detailed description of the MSS. and their relationship are left out till the publication of the whole work.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE COMMENTARY ON THE
INTRODUCTORY STANZAS.

The commentary on the first ten introductory stanzas of the R̥g-Veda-prātiśākhya, which on the basis of the evidence, shown later on, I am inclined to regard as spurious, is found in all the three MSS. of the commentary that I have collated, as well as in B^a.¹ It is also found in the Paris MS. used by M. Regnier; cf. his R̥g. Prāt., part I, pp. 21-22. It would appear from his foot-notes on pages III, VIII, and X, that the MS. a of Prof. M. Müller also contained this portion.²

At the end of this commentary the following words occur: इति श्रीदेवमित्रसुतविष्णुमित्रकृते प्रातिशाख्ये³ वर्गद्वयवृत्तिः ॥ एवं वर्णसमाम्नायमुक्त्वा तत्र लघुनोपायेन संज्ञापरिभाषाभ्यां शास्त्रे संव्यवहारसिद्धिं मन्यमानः संज्ञासंज्ञिसंवन्धार्थमाह । After this B^a adds: अष्टौ समानाचरमित्यादि । इति परावरे ब्रह्मणीत्यारभ्य सकल-देशीयवेदिकैः पद्यमानस्य वर्गद्वयस्य व्याख्या । अथ भाष्यम् । This addition is wanting in all my MSS. and seems to have been due to the editor. Then the commentary on I. 1. begins with the words: ओ ३ म् (omitted in B^a) । गमो भगवते (omitted in P) मङ्गलेश्वरश्रीमद्विष्णुलक्ष्मीनृसिंहाय । श्रीवेदपुराणाय नमः ॥ अष्टौ समानाचराणादितः ॥ किमर्थमिदमारभ्यते । &c., at least in B³, I², P, and B^a. In the introduction to the commentary on the ten introductory stanzas, Viṣṇumitra is said to be the author of the commentary. Stanzas 5-7 of this introduction read as follows:

चम्पायां न्यवसत्पूर्वं वत्सानां कुलमृद्धिमत् ।
यस्मिन्द्विजवरा जाता बहुधाः पारगोत्तमाः ॥
देवमित्र इति ख्यातस्तस्मिज्जातो महामतिः ।
स वै पारिषदे श्रेष्ठः सुतस्तस्य महात्मनः ॥
नाम्ना तु विष्णुमित्रः स कुमार इति श्रस्यते ।
तेनैवं योजिता वृत्तिः संक्षिप्ता पार्षदे स्फुटा ॥

¹ Also found in P; see above.

² Cf. also Burnell's *Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace Library at Tanjore*, pp. 1 b, 2 a; *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, Second Series, by H. P. Čāstri, vol. ii, Calcutta, 1904, p. 114, no. 136; *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College*, by Hṛishikeśa Śāstri and S. C. Gui, Calcutta, 1895, vol. i, Vedic MSS., p. 315, no. 490; *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Oriental MSS. Library, Madras*, vol. ii, Vedic Literature, Madras, 1905, p. 621, no. 883; *A Triennial Catalogue of MSS. collected during the triennium (1913-16) for the Government Oriental MSS. Library, Madras*, vol. ii, part I, Sanskrit A, Madras, 1917, p. 1281, R. no. 972; and Weber's *Catalogue of Berlin MSS.*, vol. i, no. 36.

³ M. Müller corrects प्रातिशाख्ये to प्रातिशाख्यभाष्ये on p. 1 of his edition of the R̥g-Vedaprātiśākhya. P reads प्रातिशाख्यभाष्ये for प्रातिशाख्ये.

The commentary on the rest of the *Prātiśākhya* is, however, ascribed to Uvaṭa at the end of all the *pāṭalas*, and with the exception of a few cases is called **पार्षद्व्याख्या** as well as **भाष्य**.

The first question that strikes any one is whether there is any connexion between Viṣṇumitra and Uvaṭa, and consequently between the commentary on the introductory stanzas and that on the rest of the *Prātiśākhya*. If so, what is that connexion? As we shall see later on, the first part of the question is not easy to answer, but we can arrive at some definite conclusion about the second.

Roth,¹ who appears not to have noticed the colophon at the end of the commentary on the ten introductory stanzas, and had no idea of the spuriousness of these stanzas, thought that this commentary and that on the rest of the *Prātiśākhya* were by the same author. Consequently, he had to face the discrepancy of the same work having been assigned to Uvaṭa at the end of all the *pāṭalas*, while in the introduction Viṣṇumitra is spoken of as the author of the commentary. He tried to explain this discrepancy by the suggestion that Uvaṭa, the author of the *whole* commentary, based his work on an older commentary by Viṣṇumitra.

Prof. M. Müller confidently followed Prof. Roth in this respect. He noticed the colophon at the end of the commentary on the ten introductory stanzas, in which Viṣṇumitra's name occurs, but this, instead of creating any suspicion in his mind as to the correctness of Prof. Roth's conclusion, strengthened his belief in it. This further discrepancy, he² thought, was due to the modesty of Uvaṭa, who instead of putting his own name in this colophon, as in the other colophons, mentioned that of Viṣṇumitra, whom M. Müller, like Roth, thought to be the original author of the commentary. The same view is followed generally by other scholars; e.g. J. Eggeling in the Introduction to M. Müller's *Rg-Vedaprātiśākhya* (p. 23), Winternitz and Keith in the Bodleian Catalogue (pp. 22-3), and Burnell in his Classified Index of Sanskrit MSS. (pp. 1-2) all ascribe both the portions of the commentary to Uvaṭa.

M. Regnier³ is not definite about the nature of Viṣṇumitra's work, and says that the part of the introduction to the commentary where Viṣṇumitra's name occurs is not quite clear and requires to be subjected to a new examination. The colophon at the end of the commentary on the introductory stanzas he takes simply to mean that the two stanzas (9 and 10) containing the alphabet are from a work called *Prātiśākhya* and composed by Viṣṇumitra, without any reference to the authorship of the

¹ Cf. *Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Weda*, pp. 60-1.

² Cf. his edition of the *Rg-Vedaprātiśākhya*, p. 1, foot-note.

³ Cf. his *Prātiśākhya du Rig-Véda*, part I, pp. 21-2.

commentary on these two stanzas, which he considers to be by Uvaṭa. The commentary preceding the two stanzas (अकारकीरौ, &c.), which also according to him is by Uvaṭa, Regnier takes to be the commentary on the first stanza (पराचरे, &c.) followed by long prolegomena. This is probably one of the reasons why he does not give the introductory stanzas 2-8 in his text.

To me it appears, on the contrary, that Uvaṭa either was not cognizant of the existence of the introductory stanzas, or, at least, did not regard them as forming a part of the R̥g-Vedaprātiśākhya, and consequently could not have written a commentary on them either independently or on the basis of another commentary. The strongest argument is that in the discussion at the end of the commentary on i. 3, based on the relative meaning of the words आदितः and उत्तराणि in the first two Sūtras of the Prātiśākhya, which imply a fixed order of the alphabet, Uvaṭa takes for granted that there was no portion of the Prātiśākhya giving at least a fixed order of the alphabet. He winds up the discussion by saying that though no fixed order of the alphabet is given in this Prātiśākhya, the order referred to is one of the two popular orders; and the particular order followed in this Prātiśākhya is proved, not by a direct appeal to the introductory stanzas containing the alphabet, but by an implication from the usage of the Prātiśākhya itself. The important passages in this discussion are as follows:

ननु कथं वर्णसमाम्नायमनुपदिश्यैव—अष्टौ समानाचराण्यदितः (१।१) इति । उपदिष्टस्य हि व्यपदेश एवमुपपद्यत आदित इति । नानुपदिष्टस्य । तथा—चत्वारि संध्यचराण्युत्तराणि (१।२) इत्युत्तरव्यपदेशो नैव घटत इति ॥ नैष दोषः । उपदिष्टो वर्णसमाम्नायो लौकिको विद्यते । ननु यदि लौकिकोऽत्र वर्णसमाम्नायो गृह्यत एवं तर्हि तथानुपूर्व्या भवितव्यम् । सत्यम् । आचार्यप्रवृत्त्या क्रमोऽन्यथानुमीयते । उभे अध्येते आनुपूर्व्यौ लौकिकस्य वर्णसमाम्नायस्य द्रष्टव्ये ॥

It is clear from this that the whole of this discussion would be out of place and irrelevant if Uvaṭa was cognizant of the existence of at least the two introductory stanzas अकारकीरौ, &c., as a part of the R̥g-Vedaprātiśākhya, and much more so if he himself was the author of the commentary on them.

The same conclusion is further strengthened by comparing the following passages in Uvaṭa's commentary. On i. 6, Uvaṭa says: लृकारस्य मात्रिकस्य सर्वशब्देन ग्रहणं न भविष्यति स्वरशब्देन ग्रहणात् । धातौ स्वरः कल्पय-तावृकारः (१३।३५) इति लृकारस्य स्वरसंज्ञा । Uvaṭa's reference here to xiii. 35, instead of to पदायनयोर्न लृकारः स्वरेषु in the introductory stanzas, shows his ignorance of the latter. Notice also यौ च वक्ष्यमाणौ स्वरौ—धातौ

स्वरः कल्पयतावुकारः in the commentary on i. 19. In the commentary on i. 22, Uvaṭa, while recapitulating what has gone before, begins only from अष्टौ समानाक्षराख्यादितः (१।१) without referring to the introductory stanzas. Finally, while commenting on i. 65, Uvaṭa takes pains to explain अकारादयः by अकारमादौ कृत्वा which was quite unnecessary if he knew the fixed order of the vowels given in the introductory stanzas. Moreover, had the introductory stanzas formed a part of the Prātiśākhya according to Uvaṭa, the question किमर्थमिदमारभ्यते as to the purpose of this Prātiśākhya, treated in the commentary on i. 1, ought to have been treated somewhere in the commentary on the introductory stanzas, where it would have been quite in its natural place.¹

The author of the commentary on these stanzas, however, answers (stanza 4) almost the same question in his own way, and while doing so describes this Prātiśākhya as merely a शिवाशास्त्र in opposition to Uvaṭa who, in his answer to the above question in i. 1, thinks that the subject-matter of the Prātiśākhya includes all the three शिवा, कन्दस्, and व्याकरण. This opposition of views as well as the treatment of almost the same question in two different places proves, beyond doubt, the difference of authorship in the two different cases.

The introductory verses in the beginning of the Vṛtti (i.e. the commentary on the introductory stanzas) are not by Uvaṭa as is supposed by Roth, M. Müller, and other scholars. On the contrary they are by Viṣṇumitra himself. Roth's argument, based on the use of the third and first persons referring respectively to Viṣṇumitra and Uvaṭa, is not very cogent. Both of them might refer to the same person—a fact quite in keeping with the usage of Sanskrit writers. The other argument of Roth with respect to स चैष पार्षदश्रेष्ठः (in my edition स वै पारिषदे श्रेष्ठः) is based on misconstruing this phrase as referring to Viṣṇumitra, while in fact it refers to Devamitra, his father; Cf. Müller, p. 1.

There are other traces to be found which prove conclusively that the two portions of the commentary are by different authors. The author of the above-mentioned introductory verses to the Vṛtti expressly says that he styled his work a Vṛtti and not a Bhāṣya; cf. योजिता वृत्तिः and वृत्तिमारभे, which agrees with इति वर्गद्वयवृत्तिः in the colophon of that Vṛtti.² While, on the other hand, Uvaṭa's commentary is called भाष्य at the end of almost all the *paṭalas*. Moreover, as shown above, Uvaṭa does not recognize the authenticity of the introductory stanzas, while the

¹ For other reasons proving the spuriousness of the ten introductory stanzas, see below.

² The question whether the introductory verses सूत्रभाष्यकृतः &c. and the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति are by the same author, is discussed below.

Vṛtti expressly ascribes them to Śaunaka; cf. अतोऽत्रापि शौनकाचार्यो भगवान् (introduction to stanza 1), अत आचार्यो भगवाञ्छौनको वेदार्थवित् (stanza 4).

The colophon at the end of the Vṛtti is not quite clear. The apparent meaning that the Prātiśākhya (i.e. the introductory stanzas) is by Viṣṇu-mitra is contradicted by the commentary (Vṛtti) itself, which ascribes the text to Śaunaka. The reading प्रातिशाख्यभाष्ये instead of प्रातिशाख्ये is also not free from difficulty. Unless there is some clerical mistake in this colophon, the word प्रातिशाख्य ought to be taken as referring, not to the text of the प्रातिशाख्य, but to the branch of learning as represented by his Vṛtti itself.

My conclusion, therefore, is that Uvaṭa's commentary begins from अष्टौ त्रयमात्रराष्टादितः (i. 1). It is true that the Vṛtti is generally attached to the Bhāṣya, and this fact has been the source of the wrong view as to its relation to Uvaṭa. But my view that the Vṛtti is not an integral part of Uvaṭa's commentary is also supported by the fact that there are some MSS. of Uvaṭa's commentary which do not contain this Vṛtti; cf. *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, R. Mitra, vol. iv, 1878, pp. 54-5, no. 1450; also Burnell's *Classified Index*, p. 2a (the MSS. 2,418 and 2,419 seem to be quite independent, the former being that of the Bhāṣya and the latter, most probably, that of the Vṛtti on the introductory stanzas).

THE PĀRṢADA-VṚTTI.

Before we discuss the relation of Viṣṇumitra and Uvaṭa it is necessary to say something about the Pārṣada-Vṛtti—a commentary on the R̥g. Prāt. which is partly, if not wholly, different from that of Uvaṭa, and about the authorship of which it is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion. Apart from the four MSS. (P¹ P² P³ W¹) of this Vṛtti already noticed, here is another which is described under No. 882 in *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Oriental MSS. Library, Madras*, vol. ii, Vedic Literature, Madras, 1905. I have cursorily examined the three Poona MSS. (P¹ P² P³) together with that of the Whish Collection (W¹). A comparison of different parts¹ of these MSS. shows that they in reality represent the same work; their differences amounting generally to mere differences of reading. The same thing applies to the Madras MS., as can be ascertained by comparing the quotation in the Madras Catalogue with that from the MS. of the Whish Collection.

Nevertheless there are a few facts about these MSS. which are rather

¹ Cf., for instance, the Vṛtti on i. 1 given below.

puzzling. The Poona MSS. P¹ P² (P³ ends only in the middle of *paṭala* ii) differ from W¹ in their division of the *paṭalas*, which, including that of *paṭala* xvi, is exactly the same as that adopted by myself. The Madras MS. 882 also seems to adopt the same division, as is evident from its end-colophon given in the catalogue. It is to be noticed, however, that its end, as given in the catalogue, seems to be the same as that in Uvaṭa's commentary. In the only Poona MS. (P²) which is complete towards the end, the conclusion, on the contrary, is as follows: (sic) यं ह्रस्वां वेद विशेषभूतं । - - भूतानि च त्रैलोक्यगतानि । सर्वाणि भूतानि च भक्तितो यः स्वयं जयत्येभिरथामृतत्वं । स्वयं जय (the following syllable is damaged) भिरथामृतत्वं । ऋज्वर्योयं श्लोकः द्विरक्षि (०रक्षि०) रध्यायपरिसमाप्त्यर्थं ॥ वर्यः ॥ ७ ॥ इति पार्षदव्याख्यायामष्टादशमं पटलं ॥ तृतीयोऽध्यायः समाप्तः ॥ ६०३ ॥ समाप्त्यं पार्षदव्याख्या ॥ संवत् १६२६ वर्षे, &c. On the last page of the same MS. is written in a different hand: (sic) बालकृष्णभट्टानां वृत्तिप्रातःशास्त्रपु (after this a syllable is damaged). Below this line is written: गंगाधरस्व भाग. Both these names seem to be those of successive owners of the MS.

Another noteworthy fact about these MSS. is that, while the MS. of the Whish Collection (W¹) begins at once, as Eggeling has pointed out, with अष्टौ समानाक्षराणादितः P³ reads before this, with some slight variation, the eight introductory verses [सूत्रभाष्यकृतः (in this MS. तन्त्रभाष्यविदः) to गृह्यताम (in this MS. योज्यताम)] usually found in the beginning of the Vṛtti on the introductory stanzas of the R̥g-Vedaprātiśākhya, attached to the commentary of Uvaṭa but wanting in all these MSS. of the Pārṣada-Vṛtti. In the Poona MS. P¹, the first folio being missing, only a portion of the last of these eight verses is found in a slightly different reading. In the other two MSS. (P² and the Madras MS.) the first one or more *paṭalas* are missing.

This commentary is invariably called Pārṣada-Vyākhyā in all the colophons in the Poona MSS. In W¹ it is sometimes (three times) called Pārṣada-Vṛtti and sometimes Pārṣada-Vyākhyā. In the Madras MS. 882, in the two colophons quoted in the catalogue, it is called Pārṣada-Vṛtti. The reason why I have selected the latter title for my heading is partly to distinguish it from Uvaṭa's commentary which is also called Pārṣada-Vyākhyā, but chiefly because this commentary is generally referred to as Vṛtti, as can be shown by verifying, in this commentary, most of the references to a Vṛtti in B², in marginal notes in B³, or in a footnote on p. 154 in B^a. But at the same time it is interesting to note that a passage where a Vṛtti is mentioned, and which forms a part of Uvaṭa's commentary according to all my MSS. as well as B^a, is verbally repeated, together with the mention of the Vṛtti, in this Vṛtti also. The passage occurs in the

commentary on vii. 33. and runs thus: **उपागतेति संहितायां न दृश्यते । वृत्ताविदमुदाहरणं दृष्टम् । उपागत्या सोम्यास (सोम्या सोम्या P¹; सोम्या सौम्या P²) इति । तस्यास्त्रिखितम् ।** Perhaps this reference is to a Vṛtti anterior to this Pārsada-Vṛtti.

As Prof. Eggeling¹ says, and as is evident from his comparison of a few interpretations of this commentary with those of Uvaṭa, this commentary differs considerably from that of Uvaṭa in the first four or five *paṭalas*, while in the rest it is generally, word for word, almost the same as that of Uvaṭa. It is difficult to say why Uvaṭa, who seems to have based, as is shown below, his own commentary on this commentary, should have retained, word for word, this commentary in the latter part, while in the first few *paṭalas*, even when not differing from this, he has written his own commentary. Or does it suggest that the whole of the Vṛtti is not by the same author? This is all the more probable as the scanty and doubtful evidence as to its authorship, given below, is confined to the first portion. The same suggestion cannot be applied to Uvaṭa's commentary, as Uvaṭa's name is given in almost all the colophons.

There seems to be no doubt that at least the first four or five *paṭalas* of this Vṛtti are anterior to Uvaṭa's commentary. This is evident from a few criticisms of Uvaṭa that are applicable to this Vṛtti. The division of Sūtras i. 9 and 10, for instance, adopted in this Vṛtti, is **चतस्रोऽन्तस्थास्तत उत्तरे** and **अष्टा ऊष्माणः**, while that of Uvaṭa is **चतस्रोऽन्तस्थास्ततः** and **उत्तरेऽष्टा ऊष्माणः**. The Vṛtti also expressly says that both the words **ततः** and **उत्तरे** are necessary in Sūtra 9. With this compare the remarks of Uvaṭa i. 10: **यसु—चतस्रोऽन्तस्थास्तत उत्तरे—इत्थिवं सूत्रमिच्छति तस्य**, &c. Again on i. 62 the example given in the Vṛtti with regard to cerebralization (**नत**) is: **पन्थामनु प्र विद्वान्पितृयाणम्**. Uvaṭa, however, in the commentary on the same Sūtra says: **एत्वे तूदाहरणं नास्ति ॥ उपाध्यायसु—पितृयाणम्—इत्युदाहरति । ॥ एतच्चासत्, &c.** This important passage also shows that the Upādhyāya referred to here was probably identical with the author of this Vṛtti. These passages, together with the artificiality of Uvaṭa's interpretations as opposed to the simplicity and naturalness of the same in the Vṛtti, as shown by Eggeling, prove beyond doubt that at least the first few chapters of this Vṛtti are earlier in date than Uvaṭa's commentary.

As to the author of this Vṛtti, nothing can be said with certainty. The reasons which cause this uncertainty are set forth in the next few pages. Here it may be said, however, that Viṣṇumitra's name occurs in one of the

¹ Cf. M. Müller's *Rg. Prāt.*, Introduction, pp. 22-32.

eight verses which are found, as already stated, in the beginning of this Vṛtti in P³ and (partly) in P¹. Besides, the colophon at the end of *paṭala* i. in P¹ runs thus: (sic) इति पार्षदव्याख्यायां भट्टकुमारशे(श)व्यमान (not शेष्यमान°, as given in the Poona catalogue) विष्णुमित्रकृता वृत्ती संज्ञायां पटलं नाम प्रथमः ॥ Beside these two references to Viṣṇumitra, no other reference is found, as far as I can say, in any of the MSS. noted above.

THE RELATION OF VIṢṆUMITRA AND UVAṬA.

As already stated, the question of the relation of Viṣṇumitra and Uvaṭa is not easy to answer. From the conclusion that Uvaṭa cannot be the author of the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति coupled with the fact that Viṣṇumitra is mentioned as the author of a Vṛtti in the introduction (सूत्रभाष्यकृतः, &c.) to that Vṛtti, also that his name, as shown above, occurs in the colophon to the same, one is tempted to conclude that the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति together with its introductory verses (सूत्रभाष्यकृतः, &c.) are by Viṣṇumitra. If this is so, it would appear that the latter is posterior to Uvaṭa, because he mentions a Bhāṣya and we do not know any other Bhāṣya except that by Uvaṭa. Moreover, there is no reason, if Viṣṇumitra is regarded as the author of the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति as well as anterior to Uvaṭa, why the latter did not recognize the authenticity of the ten introductory stanzas, or at least did not refer to the fact. On this supposition it must be admitted that we do not know anything about Viṣṇumitra's commentary on the rest of the Prātiśākhya. It is clear from his remark उत्तरत्रापि विचारयिष्यामः (stanza 9) that he could not have written this वर्गद्वयवृत्ति alone.

The above supposition is, however, rendered doubtful by the inexplicable fact that the verses introductory to the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति are also found, as already stated, in the beginning of the Pārṣada-Vṛtti—at least in some MSS., also that in the colophon of *paṭala* i. in P¹, as also shown above, the latter is ascribed to Viṣṇumitra. If this colophon is to be relied upon, and if the introductory verses in the Pārṣada-Vṛtti are in their original place, it would follow, this Vṛtti having been shown to be anterior to Uvaṭa, that Viṣṇumitra is also anterior to the latter, and most probably is the same as the Upādhyāya mentioned by Uvaṭa.

It might be said that the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति, as well as this पार्षदवृत्ति, are both by Viṣṇumitra. Against this supposition it can be said, firstly, that both these Vṛttis are not found together in any MS. Secondly, the Pārṣada-Vṛtti on i. 1 shows, as we have seen with regard to Uvaṭa, that the author of the same could not have been the author of the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति as well.

I give below, in full, the commentary on the first Sūtra from the Pārsada-Vṛtti, together with the various readings from its MSS. as foot-notes.

अष्टौ समानाक्षराख्यादितः ॥ वर्णसमान्नायस्यादितोऽष्टावक्षराणि¹ समानाक्षरसं-
ज्ञानि वेदितव्यानि² । अ आ ऋ ॠ इ ई उ ऊ इति । समानाक्षरसंज्ञायाः प्रयोजनम्—
समानाक्षरे संख्याने³ (२।१५) इति ॥ अत्रोच्यते । वर्णक्रमे⁴ विप्रतिपत्तिर्दृश्यते । अवर्णा-
त्परमृवर्णमेक उपदिशन्ति । उवर्णादपरे । तथा एकारात्परमोकारमेक⁵ । ऐकारादपरे ।
तथा हुकारं शकारात्पूर्वमेक उपदिशन्ति । सकारात्परमपरे । तस्माद्विप्रतिपत्तिदर्शनादि-
ष्टक्रमार्थं वर्णोपदेशः कर्तव्यः । न कर्तव्यः¹⁰ । कृत एव वर्णोपदेशो¹¹ द्रष्टव्यः ।¹²
यद्ययमादित¹⁴ उत्तराणीत्याह । नह्यनुपदिश्य वर्णानिते शक्याः¹⁵ क्रमेण¹⁶ प्रयोक्तुम् ।
एवमपि क्रमो न सिध्यति । क्रमश्च सिद्धः¹⁷ । कथम् । आचार्योपचारात् । द्वादश
स्वराणुक्ताहान्यत्र¹⁸—अक्षरादयो दश नामिनः स्वराः (१।६५) इति । तथा ।
परिवैकारमोजयोः (२।१८) औकारं युग्मयोः (२।१९) इति¹⁹ । संध्येष्वकारोऽर्थमि-
कार²¹ उत्तरं युजोवकारः (१३।३९) इति च²² । तथा । अष्टा²³ ऊष्माणः (१।१०)
अन्याः सप्त तेषामघोषाः (१।११) इति । दुस्युष्टं तु²⁴ प्राग्घकाराच्चतुर्णाम् (१३।१०) इति
च²⁶ । एतेनोपचारेण वर्णाद्वर्णस्य परत्वमेकाराच्च²² औकारस्य परत्वं हुकारस्य च²⁹
शकारात्पूर्वत्वम्³⁰ ॥

It is clear from this that the author of this Vṛtti, who holds that there is no need of giving a fixed order of the alphabet in this treatise, as it can be deduced from the usage of the teacher himself, cannot be the author of the वर्णद्वयवृत्ति. Now if this conclusion is accepted, it is very doubtful whether the verses introductory to both these Vṛttis are really a part of the one or the other. In either case, the contradictory evidence of both the colophons noted above, as well as the presence of these verses in both the Vṛttis, remain to be explained. That the name of Viṣṇumitra is a source of confusion is further supported by its being mentioned, as shown elsewhere, in the last colophon of P, which represents, as already stated, the

¹ ष्टाक्षराणि W¹. P¹ omits वर्णो—०राणि.

² P¹ adds आदितः अष्टौ ये वर्णाः.

³ P³, संख्यानि W¹, तत्सान P¹.

⁴ वर्णसमान्नाये W¹.

⁵ W¹ adds उपदिशन्ति.

⁶ ऐकारम् P¹.

⁷ W¹ omits परम्.

⁸ P³, एतस्माद् P¹, एवं W¹.

⁹ इष्टं P¹.

¹⁰ उच्यते (for न कर्तव्यः) W¹.

¹¹ ऽंशे P³.

¹² W¹ adds कथं ।

¹³ यदा० W¹.

¹⁴ ०तः । तत W¹.

¹⁵ शक्या P¹, शक्ताः P³, W¹.

¹⁶ W¹ omits क्रमेण.

¹⁷ सिध्यत्येव W¹.

¹⁸ P¹ आचार्योपचारात् अन्यत्र द्वादश स्वरा उक्ताः इह तु P³, आचार्यस्योपदेशादुत्तरत्र

दश स्वराणाह । W¹.

¹⁹ W¹ adds च.

²⁰ ०ज्वि० W¹.

²¹ ०ज्वि० corrected to ०ज्व० in P¹.

²² इतिकार P¹.

²³ W¹ omits च.

²⁴ P¹, अष्टौ P³, W¹.

²⁵ दुस्यष्टानु W¹, दुःस्यष्टाश्च

P³, omitted in P¹.

²⁶ P¹ omits प्राग्घकारा०.

²⁷ P¹ omits च.

²⁸ एतेनोपदेशेना० W¹.

²⁹ उ० P³.

³⁰ P³, च omitted in W¹, P¹.

³¹ W¹ adds सिद्धं भवतीति.

same work as the commentary of Uvata, whose name is often mentioned in other colophons of that MS.¹

THE STYLE, METRE, AND GRAMMAR OF THE R̥G-VEDAPRĀTISĀKHYA.

Making allowance for the metre, which is sometimes a cause of indirect as well as obscure construction, the style of the R̥g-Vedaprātisākhya is, on the whole, direct and clear. Though treating its subject, in most of the *paṭalas*, in the same way as other works in the Sūtra style, as is evident from the uninterrupted string of short sentences, often without any finite verb, from the observance, however partial, of the Law of Anuvṛtti, and from the occasional treatment, without any word expressive of transition, of different unconnected facts in the same stanza, this Prātisākhya is free from most of the defects of that style. No attempt is made to economize words at the expense of the meaning, and there is no trace of that ingenuity which renders the style artificial and enigmatical. This can be illustrated by the presence of connecting words like तु and पुनः, and by many finite verbal forms. No doubt simple verbs like the copula are generally omitted, but in many cases the absence of a verb is also due to the requirements of the metre. The Law of Anuvṛtti is not strictly followed; otherwise words like प्रगृह्याः (i. 73), नियमम् (iii. 22), स्वरभक्तिः (vi. 50), स्वरभक्तिः (vi. 36), as well as occasional repetition of न in successive Sūtras (cf. vi. 7 and 8) could easily be avoided. There are no artificial or conventional technical terms to be found like those invented by Pāṇini (e.g. घ) or in the Vājasaneyi-Prātisākhya (e.g. सिम्). The system of abbreviation known as प्रत्याहार in Pāṇini is also wanting in our Prātisākhya.²

It is a characteristic feature of our Prātisākhya that almost every phenomenon of euphonic combination (संधि) is called by a technical term, and though it is sometimes not easy to distinguish the meaning of one

¹ A Svāmikumāra is mentioned in Uvata's commentary on the last Sūtra of the R̥g. Prāt. We do not know whether he is the same as Viṣnumitra, who also was known as Kumāra; cf. कुमार इति शस्यते (introduction to the वर्गद्वयवृत्ति). But the commentary on the last Sūtra being very corrupt and largely out of place, as yet we cannot attach much importance to this doubtful piece of evidence. Cf. also the *Lists of Sanskrit MSS. in Private Libraries of Southern India*, by G. Oppert, vol. ii. In this volume six Prātisākhya MSS. under Nos. 7260, 7401, 7963, 8662, 9060, 9882 are ascribed to a कुमारस्वामी. But unfortunately no further detail about the MSS. is given.

² Cf. Bruno Liebhich, *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft*, ii, *Historische Einführung und Dhāpupāṭha*, Heidelberg, 1919, p. 31.

from the other, and thus to assign their exact connotation, the terms are significant. Moreover, these terms are not always referred to again in the Prātiśākhya; so that it is clear that they do not aim at brevity, as is the case with the artificial symbols of Pāṇini, about which Patañjali says: लघुर्थं संज्ञाकरणम्. It is another question whether these terms were invented by the author of the Rġ-Vedaprāt., or were borrowed from other sources. That they were, most probably, not confined to the Prātiśākhya is shown by the fact that some of them are found in the other Prātiśākhyas, as, for instance, the names of different circumflex accents, and some not found in the other Prātiśākhyas are found in the Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-sūtra, e.g. पञ्चालपदवृत्ति.¹

As regards the technical syntax of the grammatical technical language,² there is only one³ rule given in the Rġ-Vedaprātiśākhya by which the letter to be changed is put in the nominative, and the resulting letter in the accusative. The main object of similar Sūtras in Pāṇini⁴ is conciseness, and they are made use of consistently there. But the above rule is here sometimes disregarded in the wording of Sūtras like ii. 10, which, were it not so, could be made more concise. The presence of such words as स्वाम् in ii. 21, स्वान् in iv. 2, which are quite unnecessary in view of यथान्तरम् in i. 56, also shows that the Prātiśākhya, in spite of its own rules aiming at brevity, is not very particular about conciseness.

In connexion with this question of technical syntax, it will be of interest to note that the style of this Prātiśākhya presents a stage in the Sūtra style which is anterior to that of Pāṇini, and which might reasonably be regarded as transitional to the latter. Pāṇini,⁵ for instance, assigns new and peculiar meanings to the ablative and locative cases. Though no corresponding rules are found in the Rġ-Vedaprātiśākhya, and though most often a word like परम् with the ablative (e.g. ii. 35: अकारात्परम्) and उदये with the locative (e.g. ii. 32: ऋकार उदये) is used, still in some cases the tendency to omit such words and to use the ablative (e.g. xiv. 57: रक्तात्) or the locative (e.g. ii. 52: खरेषु) by itself in the same sense is also noticeable. This partial rejection of such auxiliary words must be regarded as a precursor to their total rejection in Pāṇini.

Similarly the instrumental case, though mostly used with some such words as 'preceded by' (उपहित), sometimes stands by itself, and has the

¹ Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra, xii. 13. 5. Cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, iv. 75.

² Cf. Burnell, *On the Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians*, pp. 43 and 117.

³ i. 56; cf. also Bruno Liebich, *Zur Einführung in die ind. einh. Sprachw.*, ii, § 53.

⁴ Pāṇini, i. 1, 49, 50, 66, and 67. Similar Sūtras are also found in the Vājasaneyi-Prāt.

⁵ Cf. Pāṇini, i. 1, 66 and 67.

same meaning. The genitive case with proper names means 'in the opinion of', a word like **मते** being understood.¹ If a Sūtra is meant to serve the purpose of an **अधिकार** or general heading, a word like **यद्योक्तम्** or **यद्योपदिष्टम्** is almost invariably added, e. g. v. 1.

As regards the method of quoting Vedic words, it might be said, first of all, that they are, as a rule, not inflected by the author of the Prātisākhya. They are given in whatever inflexion they occur in the Saṁhitā. So that, unless they are followed by the words **इति**, **एवम्**, a demonstrative pronoun or any two of the same, it is sometimes difficult to make out in what relation they stand to the rest of the Sūtra, or to the Section, in which they occur.² If, however, a rule is intended for various inflexional forms of a word, a word such as **शब्द** or **प्रवाद** is compounded with the stem form of the word.³ Then the word thus compounded is inflected as required. There are, however, a few cases where a Vedic word, in one case even an indeclinable, is inflected; cf. **इवे** (ii. 55), **नार्षदः**⁴ (v. 30), **वेयश्चे**⁵ (xiv. 41). Vedic words also appear, sometimes, as compounded⁶ with some other words; e. g. **येषुकंशासदुत्तरम्** (viii. 11), **खसयउत्तराणि** (viii. 14). In referring to a *gaṇa* the word or phrase beginning that *gaṇa* is generally given in whatever form it occurs in the Saṁhitā, e. g. **योनिमरिगादिषु** (vii. 4), **चक्रुरादिषु** (vii. 47); in some cases, however, only the stem form of the word is compounded with the word **आदि**, e. g. **समुद्रादिषु** (vii. 48).

The words are not given, as might be expected in a Prātisākhya, in the Pada-form, but rather in the Saṁhitā-form, with the exception that the changes in a word supposed to have been caused by the association of a preceding or a following word in the Saṁhitā are not shown in the absence of those words; e. g. **गूर्धय** (xviii. 2), in the Saṁhitā **गूर्धया**, **भवत** for **भवता** (vii. 22). **अवय** (according to most MSS.), instead of **आवय**⁷ in vii. 33 seems to be an exception.⁸ **अस्कृत** instead of **अकृत** in xi. 9 is probably due to the influence of **खसारम्** in the same Sūtra. The Pada-

¹ Cf. Bruno Liebhich, *Zur Einführung in die ind. einh. Sprache*, ii, § 52.

² e. g. vii. 14, 23, 50.

³ e. g. iv. 23 and 49. Cf. also **नःकारे**, viii. 12, 37.

⁴ Only two forms, **नार्षदम्** and **नार्षदाय**, occur in R.V.

⁵ According to some MSS.

⁶ Both Reg. and M. M. write the words, in such cases, separately, as if they were not compounded.

⁷ Cf. **यावय** in the same Sūtra and **आवय** in ix. 32.

⁸ Cf. also **अननु** in ix. 33.

forms अञ्जःपाः and दुःप्र in xiii. 30 are given because the Sūtra is meant only for the Pada-text.

Excepting compound words, parts of which are sometimes given, words which are not compounds are generally quoted in full. In a few cases parts of simple words are quoted (cf. ix. 26 and 32), but the fact is clearly stated by the author himself (cf. ix. 25, 31, and 34). In two other similar cases, हि for नहि (iv. 97) and (according to some MSS.) व for वयति (viii. 18), the author does not say anything to that effect. With regard to the former Uvaṭa says: नहीत्येतत्पदे हीति यत्पदावयवग्रहणं तच्छब्दोभङ्गमयात् । With regard to the latter, Uvaṭa is silent, and this is one of the reasons why I have adopted the reading, i.e. च for व.

If a Vedic quotation contains more words than are necessary to show the application of a rule, the extra words in such cases are generally meant to restrict the application of that rule only to that quotation. In some cases, however, this explanation does not hold good, the presence of extra words being quite superfluous. With regard to such cases Uvaṭa says: (ii. 77) अत्र येषां विशेषणपदानामुदाहरणानि न विद्यन्ते तेषां कन्दःपरिपूर्तिः फलम् ।

METRE.

The R̥g-Vedaprātisākhya is composed partly in the Anuṣṭubh metre and partly in the Triṣṭubh or Jagatī metres.¹ There are a few irregular stanzas which generally, according to the prevalence of the Pādas, can be assigned to one or the other of the three metres. Besides, there are four stanzas with Pādas of nine syllables each; one with ten-syllabic Pādas; and one with six-syllabic Pādas. I give below a chart showing the number of stanzas in different metres in different *paṭalas*, also their total number separately as well as together. I have not included the first ten introductory stanzas in this account.

Triṣṭubh Pādas occasionally interchange with Jagatī Pādas, excepting those in *paṭala* xviii, which are not only free from this admixture but are of the type of the regular classical metres—Indravajrā or Upajāti. It will appear from the chart given below that the tendency of the work is to write either in Anuṣṭubh or in Triṣṭubh or in both. The Jagatī metre is rarely used except in *paṭala* xi, which is entirely in that metre. Moreover, the Jagatī metre employed in this *paṭala* is of the type of the regular classical metre called Vainśastha, the only irregularities (according to some MSS.) being °योग° for °योगं in stanza 13, and दूणाश्° for दूणश्° in stanza 20. This exceptional character of *paṭala* xi is very important,

¹ Cf. A. A. Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, Introduction, p. xxvi.

Pāṭalas	Trisṭubh stanzas, some of them with 1 or 2 Jagati Pādas	Trisṭubh stanzas with 1 or 2 Pādas of 10	Jagatis	Jagatis with 1 Pāda of 11	Jagatis with 2 Pādas of 10	Anuṣṭubhs	Anuṣṭubhs defective	Stanzas with all Pādas of 9	Stanzas with all Pādas of 10	Stanzas with all Pādas of 6	Miscellaneous stanzas
1st	22	..	2	1	..	1 (24th)	
2nd	15	3	2	3	2	16	2	1 (34th)	
3rd	19	
4th	22	..	3	14	2	
5th	16	..	1	10	1 (27th)	..	
6th	14	..	1	
7th	13	..	2	2	..	14	2	(16th) Pādas 1, 3 = 12 ,, 2, 4 = 13
8th	14	1	4	2	..	8	..	1 (18th)	
9th	16	1	4	7	(7th) 1, 3 = 12 ; 3 = 13 ; 4 = 14 (17th) Pādas 1, 3, 4 = 9 ; 2 = 12
10th	14	
11th	37	
12th	5	..	2	2	
13th	11	1	1	1	..	6	
14th	29	(26th) Pādas 1 = 12 ; 3 = 13 ; 2, 4 = 11
15th	16	
16th	51	7	1 (37th)	..	1 (10th)	
17th	30	2	
18th	9	23	2	
Total	202	6	59	8	2	215	17	4	1	1	4 Grand Total 519

as we shall see later on. Of the seventeen defective Anuṣṭubh stanzas there are ten with one Pāda of nine syllables, one with two Pādas of nine, five with one Pāda of seven, and one with one Pāda of six. Of those containing one or two Pādas of nine only a few Pādas begin with two short syllables. In some cases the excess of one syllable is due to Vedic quotations. In some cases, however, the excess is due to the restoration of the Sandhi between two Pādas, without which the end of the odd Pādas would not coincide with the end of a word; e.g. iv, stanza 33. All the Pādas having one or two syllables short contain Vedic quotations, and the number of syllables can be restored by means of Vyūha; in one case (xvi, stanza 15) Vyūha is expressly enjoined by the Prātiśākhya itself.

There are about twenty-seven instances of hiatus found between the Pādas of stanzas in various metres. The hiatus is generally removed, in most of the MSS., by euphonically combining the vowels. But the Sandhi has to be separated in order to restore the metre. I have, therefore, followed Prof. Macdonell's edition of the Brhaddevatā in restoring the hiatus in all such cases in my text.¹ There are a few cases where the number of the syllables of different Pādas did not require this restoration, but in that case the odd Pādas (first or third) would end in the middle of a word, which is against the practice as well as an express rule (xvii. 24) of the Prātiśākhya itself. There is only one case in the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya where the end of a Pāda coincides with the end of a word in a compound; cf. vii, stanza 29. Excepting this one instance, I have followed Prof. Macdonell in separating also the two halves of the line throughout the text.

GRAMMAR.

With regard to euphonic combination, the rule² of changing final *au* to *a* before *u* or *ū* and to *āv* before other vowels is observed in the best MSS. I have kept this difference. I have also followed the common practice of the MSS. in dropping Visarjaniya before a sibilant plus a hard consonant, which is also supported by a rule (iv. 36) of the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya. The omission of Visarjaniya also occurs sporadically in the MSS. before a sibilant plus a nasal consonant or a semivowel. I have not adopted this practice as it has no authority in either of the Prātiśākhyas or in Pāṇini. The MSS. are not consistent³ with regard to the nature of the nasal sound resulting

¹ This is not observed in the text given in the Sūtra form with the commentary.

² Cf. ii. 25 and 31.

³ Cf. M. Müller on iv. 80; also foot-notes on iv, stanzas 28-35, in my text of the Prātiśākhya where, for the sake of illustration, I have with regard to this matter given collations from different MSS.

from the treatment of a final *n* like a Visarjaniya; it being represented sometimes by Anusvāra (·) and sometimes by Anunāsika. I have universally adopted the latter, as it is expressly enjoined by this Prātiśākhya (cf. iv. 80).¹ The practice of Vedic MSS. of writing *ḍ* and *ḍh* as *ḷ* and *ḷh* between vowels is generally followed in the best MSS.

The Rg-Vedaprātiśākhya does not usually follow the rule of not contracting a final *a* or *ā* or any other monophthong² with a following *r* or *ṛ*, though a rule (ii. 32) to that effect with regard to *a* and *ā* before *r* is expressly laid down in the Prātiśākhya; e.g. रेफकारकारपरः (v. 23), सहवत्सर्त° (ix. 21), लुकारात् (vii. 1), मातेलुकारे (ii. 64). There are, however, two cases where this rule is observed; cf. परिप्रच्छधीन्नादिषु (v. 43), पूषत्त (for °ता) च्छतावरीरिव (ix. 51). The latter occurs at the end of the first Pāda of a line. ऊष्मान्तस्था (or °स्थ) ऋसोष्म° (xii. 1), according to some MSS., is another instance. The hiatus is also retained in Vedic quotations; e.g. सप्तच्छपीन् (vii. 45). The Vedic Sandhi of dropping a final *n* after *ā* and nasalizing the preceding vowel (iv. 80) is retained in a Vedic word before a vowel; e.g. आदित्यौ उषसाम् (ii. 73), देवाँ इति (iv. 66). The change of the final *n* to *r* and the nasalization of the preceding vowel (iv. 80), is retained before a semivowel in युवन्वूर्ध्वनिषीष्ट (iv. 69). The Vedic Sandhi of the final *n* in अस्मान् before *c* is retained in अस्माच्चमसान् (iv. 75), but cf. चमसौञ्च (iv. 74). The hiatus is not avoided in इउसंधौ (xiv. 60), सुक्ते असिक्वाम् (xvii. 43); while according to the first interpretation of Uvāṭa *a* is elided after a *Pragṛhya* in अवरेऽपृथक्° (xiii. 40). एषो³ बृहती (xviii. 25) is another irregular Sandhi according to some MSS. The cerebralization in द्विवंधयः (ii. 80) is confined to *chanḍas* according to Pāṇini.⁴ I have adopted षणवतिः (xvi. 90) instead of षस्रवतिः which is required according to a Vārttika⁵ on Pāṇini viii. 4, 42. The word सोष्मवान् (xi. 25) is very curious. Some MSS. have attempted to correct it to चोष्मवान्. It might be taken as an unusual Sandhi of सः plus ऊष्मवान्, though the construction requires an accusative instead of सः, or it might be taken in the sense of 'the part (of a word) containing an aspirate'. The only other possible way is to take it simply in the sense of 'an aspirate', the addition of either स (= सह) or -वत् being superfluous and irregular. The reading नवकाष्ट (xvi. 53) found in most MSS. is probably another instance of irregular Sandhi for नवकोऽष्ट.

¹ Cf. also xiv. 37 where Anusvāra in such cases is expressly declared to be a fault.

² Cf. Pāṇini, vi. 1, 128.

³ See note.

⁴ Cf. viii. 3, 106.

⁵ अनास्रवतिनगरीणामिति वक्तव्यम् ।

The irregularities with regard to nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and verbs are also interesting. The Vedic form **ता** instead of **तानि** is used in **ता वयंगमनि** (iv. 14). Forms like **षट्**, **सप्त** (xvi. 24), &c., are used¹ in the sense of **षट्कः**, **सप्तकः**, &c. Possessive adjectives like **अष्टी** (ix. 28), **सप्ती** (xvi. 20), **द्वादशी**² (xvi. 40), formed from stems which end in *n* according to the Sanskrit Grammarians,³ occur very often. **त्रिपञ्चकाः** (xvi. 18) is probably for **त्रिः पञ्चकाः**, or if it is a *dvigu* compound both number and gender are noteworthy. **ओ** is used without inflection in **ओ भवति** (ii. 33). Names of the Pragāthas derived from compounds are often irregularly formed; e.g. **महावार्हतः**⁴ (xviii. 10), **काकुभवार्हतः**⁵ (xviii. 19). **पद्याः** (ii. 12) in the masculine is used with **तानि**. **वचन** is once used as a masculine (xiii. 20). **जीव** as a name of a metre is used as a neuter (xvii. 5). **प्रेष्ठम्वादि** in the neuter appears to be used for **प्रेष्ठम्वादिः** (xvii. 49). The form **परिपातयन्ति** (xiv. 37) which is the reading of all the text and commentary MSS. for **परिपादयन्ति** may be regarded as an irregularity, the latter reading being based only on marginal corrections in some MSS.⁶

As regards compounds, Uvaṭa takes **अन्वचरसंधिवक्तुः** (iv. 37) as equal to **अन्वचरवक्तुसंधिः**. **पदव्यवायि** (xi. 13), according to most MSS., appears for **व्यवायिपदम्**. **पादादिरन्तश्च** (iv. 56) means **पादादिः पादान्तश्च**. With regard to syntax, the nominative **गायत्र्यः** (xvii. 4) is once used for the accusative. The accusative with **इति** instead of the nominative occurs with several words in xv. 12. **अन्ते** is once used with the accusative (i. 62); and several times with the ablative; e.g. xi. 70. **अधि** is several times used with the ablative, but not in the same sense (cf. Uvaṭa); e.g. **शास्त्रादधि** (xiv. 64), **एकाचरादधि** (xvi. 5). **अधि** in xi. 61 is probably used with **अतः**, or it may be taken with **क्रमे**. The forms of the demonstrative pronoun **तद्** are often used for those of **एतद्** or **इदम्**; e.g. iv. 49, 61, 83. The imperfect **वायसोऽब्रवीत्** (xiii. 48) has the sense of the present tense. The order of the words is occasionally

¹ Cf. Śaṅguruṣiṣya (p. 65) on Sarvānukramaṇi, Introduction, iv. 3: **प्रत्येकान्वयिनः कनो लुक् छान्दसः । षट्कः । &c.**

² Cf. the Vārttika: **शशतोर्दिनिच्छन्दसि** on Pāṇini, v. 1, 58; 2, 37.

³ Cf. Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, §§ 484, and 1230 b.

⁴ Cf. Śaṅguruṣiṣya (p. 75) on Sarvānukramaṇi, Introduction, xi. 4: **उत्तरपदवृद्धिच्छान्दसी । अन्वया माहावृहत इति हि प्राप्नोति ।**

⁵ The Vṛddhi of the second element is not an irregularity if the words like **वार्हतः** are taken in the sense of **बृहती**; &c.; cf. the Vārttika: **छन्दसः प्रत्ययविधाने नपुंसके स्वार्थ उपसंख्यानम्** on Pāṇini, iv, 2, 55. Cf. also **वार्हते**, Rg. Prāt. xviii. 5.

⁶ The latter reading is also found in P¹, P²; see note.

disregarded, especially in the case of particles; e.g. च परक्रमे द्वे (i. 26). In one case the prefix is separated from its verb: प्र बाधन्व उवाच (xi. 65). With regard to prepositions, आ is separated from the ablative by one word in आ वा शेषात् (iii. 20), and so अनु from the accusative in समाधिमुखानु (xi. 63).

VOCABULARY.

As regards vocabulary, it might be said first of all, that the Prāṭisākhya, as stated above, has many peculiar technical terms for different euphonic combinations, some of which have not been noted elsewhere; e.g. अन्वचर-संधिवक्त्र (iv. 37), अकाम and नियत (iv. 30).¹ The list of the names of different faults in pronunciation in paṭala xiv is also interesting. Other interesting words, some of which have not been noted elsewhere, are: वर्त्य (i. 46) from वर्त्स; प्रतिकण्डम् (i. 54) in the sense of an irregular formation, and equal to निपातनम् in grammar; प्रत्याम्नाय (i. 61) meaning 'contradiction' as opposed to प्रत्याम्नायुः (xv. 15) in the sense of 'to repeat' or 'to recite again'; न्याय (i. 53) equal to उत्सर्ग in grammar; द्विवचस् (i. 71); प्रत्यय² (iv. 41 and 45) meaning a subsequent word or sound, as opposed to its meaning in Pāṇini restricted to an affix or suffix; पूर्वपद्य (iv. 50) beside पूर्वपद (ix. 27); समास (x. 16) in the general sense of अवगृह्य; वैकृत and प्राकृत (ii. 34) from विकृति and प्रकृति; प्रवाद in the sense of both declension (e.g. ix. 5) and conjugation (x. 7); वृत्ति (iv. 38) meaning usage; स्थान in the sense of duration (vi. 39; xiii. 7); स्वार (iii. 8) meaning स्वरित; स्वर्यति (iii. 17); विच्छेद (vi. 47) for अभिनिधान; गुण³ (xi. 10) in the same sense as in Pāṇini; द्वियोनि (xi. 3) meaning a diphthong; चोदक (x. 15) meaning परिग्रह; निराह (xi. 16); निर्ज्वल (xi. 62); यावन (xi. 22); महाप्रदेश (xi. 42); अध्ववसाय (xi. 35); व्यवस्थिति (xviii. 57); दोष (xi. 47) meaning change; प्रसिद्ध (xi. 66) meaning existence; सकल (xiv. 25) in its literal meaning 'with parts'; महत्⁴ (xiv. 49) meaning either a conjunct consonant or a heavy vowel; प्रस्वार (xv. 5) meaning औकार; आकृति (xviii. 4); महासतोमुखा (xviii. 27) &c. It may be added that some of the words like अपृक्त, उपधा are used here in their literal meaning, and not in the restricted

¹ As regards the interesting names of different metres (परमेष्ठौ सर्षोका, &c.) which occur in paṭala xvii, it should be noted that most of them are also found in the Nidānasūtra; cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, viii. 106-13.

² Cf. Bruno Liebich, *Zur Einführung in die ind. einh. Sprache*, ii, §§ 36 and 50.

³ Cf. Uvaṭa.

⁴ Cf. Uvaṭa.

sense given to them in other works. That is why they are not defined here as in Pāṇini or in other works.¹

THE TEXT OF THE ṚG-VEDAPRĀTISĀKHYA.

The text of the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya consists of eighteen *paṭalas* divided into three *adhyāyas* of six *paṭalas* each. Each *paṭala* is divided into *vargas*. The *vargas* generally consist of five stanzas each, except at the end of a *paṭala* where they vary in length from three stanzas to six.² This practice about the length of the *vargas* is, however, not strictly followed in *paṭalas* xi-xiii, xvi, and xvii.

A few MSS. of the text (C³, C⁵, and partly M) number the *paṭalas* separately for each *adhyāya*, but I have, following the majority of the text MSS., as well as all my MSS. of the commentary, numbered them consecutively for the whole work. That the division into *paṭalas* is really the most original can be proved by the internal evidence of the Prātiśākhya itself, as it is referred to in Sūtras iv. 20, and vi. 16. That this is also more real than that into *adhyāyas* and *vargas* is clear from the fact that while the latter divisions are merely artificial or mechanical, the former is to some extent based on the division of the subject-matter. It is for this reason as well as for the sake of convenience that in giving references to the Sūtras or the stanzas of the Prātiśākhya I have referred only to *paṭalas*, and not to *adhyāyas* or *vargas*. This coincidence of the division of the *paṭalas* with that of the subject-matter has mainly led me to include stanzas 53-60 in *paṭala* xvi. The ten introductory stanzas, having been elsewhere shown to be spurious, are not included in the text of the Prātiśākhya. The commentary on them has also been separated from Uvaṭa's commentary.

THE TEXT OF THE ṚG-VEDAPRĀTISĀKHYA ACCORDING TO THE COMMENTARY OF UVAṬA.

As we shall see later on, there are traces of successive additions to be found in the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya, and the text, as it has come down to us, cannot be the work of one and the same author. Before entering on the examination of this question it is better to say something about the text of the Prātiśākhya adopted by Uvaṭa for his commentary, because in the choice of readings for the text I have given the chief

¹ Cf. Pāṇini, i. 2, 41; i. 1, 65; see also Vāj. Prāt., i. 151; i. 35; Ath. Prāt., i. 92; Tait. Prāt., i. 54.

² Cf. Ṛ.V. and Bṛhaddevatā.

weight to his authority so as to obtain as far as possible the text which he had before him in the eleventh century.¹ It has been proved above that Uvaṭa did not recognize the authenticity of the ten introductory stanzas. As they are wanting in the Pārṣada-Vṛtti which, as shown above, is, in all probability, anterior to Uvaṭa, and as the commentary on them is not by Uvaṭa, it is reasonable to assume that the stanzas were added to the Prātiśākhya after Uvaṭa's time. The fact that these stanzas are found in varying numbers in different MSS. is another proof of their spuriousness. They are all wanting in W, and C⁵ has only the first. Another proof consists in this, that in all² the MSS. of Uvaṭa's commentary the numbering of Sūtras, stanzas, and *vargas* begins from अष्टौ समानाचरा-ख्यादितः (i. 1). Even in the text MSS. they are generally kept apart, and are not counted with the genuine stanzas of the Prātiśākhya. Of these ten stanzas, stanzas 5, 6, and 8 also occur at the end of the Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya. The stanza शिवाच्छन्दोव्याकरणैः &c. is wanting in all my text MSS., though occurring in the commentary on the first Sūtra. It is obviously a part of the commentary, and cannot be regarded as a part of the Prātiśākhya as Prof. Goldstücker³ sought to maintain. In *paṭala* xvi the stanza एकोत्तरो यजुर्वेगः⁴ &c. occurs in all the text MSS. either after the first or the second line of stanza 8. It is, however, wanting in the commentary MSS. except in B³, where this stanza, followed by the remark त्रैपकः, is added by the scribe. There can be no doubt about the spuriousness of the stanza, because it is wanting in the commentary, and because it is merely a repetition of what is already said in xvi. 11. Stanza 10 of the same *paṭala* is, in the commentary MSS., written as a part of the commentary of the preceding Sūtra, but taking into consideration the usual number (i.e. five) of stanzas in a *varga*, as well as owing to its occurrence in all the text MSS., it is, no doubt, a part of the Prātiśākhya.

Stanza 50 of the same *paṭala* contains an extra line. This is the only instance of its kind in the Prātiśākhya and would readily suggest that the line is a later addition. It is found in all my text MSS. except in W. It is found in my commentary MSS. also, but the commentary on it is omitted in I². According to Prof. Regnier the commentary on it is wanting also in the Paris MS. and the Berlin MS. 394. That Uvaṭa could not have regarded it as authentic appears from his commentary on xvii. 21. There

¹ On the date of Uvaṭa, see Bhandarkar, *Report*, 1882-3, pp. 3, 191; Stein, *Kāśmīr Catalogue*, p. xii.

² Cf. Regnier's *Ṛg-Vedaprāt.*, part I, p. 22 (top).

³ See *Academy*, July, 1870, p. 272. Cf. also M. Müller, *Ṛg-Vedaprāt.*, pp. ix and xi.

⁴ Cf. Regnier (part III, p. 140) and M. Müller (p. ccciii).

he refers to the three stanzas (i. 191, 10–12) of the R̥gveda as the instances where the metre, though doubtful according to the Pādas, is determined according to the number of the syllables. If this line were authentic and if the commentary on it, which quotes the first (सूर्ये विषमा^१) of the three R̥.V. stanzas as an instance of महापङ्क्ति, were by Uvaṭa, it is clear that Uvaṭa's reference to them as of doubtful metre, in the commentary on xvii. 21, is not quite appropriate. To meet this objection some of the MSS. add, in the commentary on xvii. 21 : ननु च अष्टको सप्तकः षड् इति ये पठन्ति तेषामुदाहरणं न भवति। तेषां शिवा नः सख्या संलिति।¹ This passage is obviously an interpolation as it is not found even in some of those MSS. which contain the commentary on the line in question. It would appear from this that though Uvaṭa might have read this line, as it is found in all the commentary MSS., he did not regard it as authentic, and that he did not comment upon it. There are other reasons also which conclusively prove that the line is spurious. Stanza 51 which follows this line while referring to 'these two groups' (ब्रूह्योरेतयोः) does not refer to this line, but to the two Sūtras given before the line. It is clear that, had the line been genuine, it could not have been passed over in that reference. The other argument consists in this, that stanza 52 of *paṭala* xvi, though giving examples for the rule (xvi. 75) which precedes this line and also for the following one (xvi. 77), does not give any example for this line.

The second line (संपति त्वेति, &c.) of stanza 51 of the same *paṭala* is found in all my commentary as well as text MSS. except W, which reads instead of it: (sic) अष्टाचरास्त्रयः पादाः क्वचिद्वादशका द्वौ । Uvaṭa does not explain it, nor is its meaning quite clear. A marginal note in B³ says that the line is an interpolation (चिपकं). To me it appears that the line is not an interpolation but is a wrong reading, which is the cause of the obscurity of its meaning.

Stanza 19 of *paṭala* iii, though found in all the commentary and text MSS., is not explained by Uvaṭa. This, coupled with the fact that the stanza is added at the end of the *paṭala* at least shows that Uvaṭa did not regard it as authentic. Moreover the stanza is a mere repetition of what is already said in stanza 3. The last two stanzas (8, 9) of *paṭala* xii. seem to be of the same sort. They are also found in all the commentary and text MSS. but are not explained by Uvaṭa, though some commentary MSS. add : अन्वर्थविती. It is noteworthy that the first of these two stanzas also occurs in the Vāj. Prāt. (viii. 54, 55) and is fully explained there by Uvaṭa. The same applies to the last two stanzas (19 and 20) of *paṭala* xiii. The last one is omitted in W. Both are omitted in the MSS. P¹ and P² of the

¹ Cf. Regnier and M. Müller.

Pārsada-Vṛtti. Uvaṭa's commentary on xiii. 47 shows that he did not regard the first of these two stanzas as a part of the Prātiśākhya. The five stanzas, dealt with above, are of the nature of 'floating verses'. That is the reason why some of them are found in works of different authorship. Some of them may be regarded not as a part of the Prātiśākhya but as mere quotations by Uvaṭa and as such a part of his commentary. In their case, their occurrence in the text MSS. may be taken as subsequent to their occurrence in the commentary.

LACK OF UNITY IN THE AUTHORSHIP¹ OF THE RG-VEDAPRĀTIŚĀKHYA.

As far as I can say, Prof. Regnier was the first to point out that the R̥g-Vedaprātiśākhya is a work gradually built up. His critical remarks about different *paṭalas*,² in this respect, are a proof of his keen observation and accurate judgement. But unfortunately he did not deal with the question in detail, his criticisms being only of a general nature. Moreover, sometimes he seems to go too far when, without any further proof, he sees in a mere want of method or order in a portion of the Prātiśākhya, a trace of compilation.³ Prof. Whitney⁴ also was of the same opinion that parts of the R̥g-Vedaprātiśākhya are later accretions.

A careful reading of the R̥g-Vedaprātiśākhya is bound to convince anybody that the work as a whole cannot be the work of one and the same author. The different parts of the work are only loosely connected with each other, there being no unity of subject-matter running throughout the work. For instance, the continuity of the subject-matter running through the first eleven *paṭalas* is wanting in the twelfth and thirteenth *paṭalas*, which are only a sort of appendix. The last part, i.e. *paṭalas* xvi-xviii, which deals exclusively with metre, has no connexion whatever with the preceding *paṭalas*. Besides this want of unity of subject-matter in the different parts of the Prātiśākhya, we meet also, as shown below, with contradictions and repetitions which can be explained or justified only on the assumption of the diversity of their authorship. Moreover, the first *paṭala*, which serves the purpose of a general introduction to the work,

¹ As regards the date of Śaunaka who, according to the tradition, the first of the ten introductory stanzas, and the introduction to the Vargadvayavṛtti, is the author of the R̥g. Prāt., cf. Macdonell, Bṛhaddevatā, Introduction, pp. xxii-iv; Keith, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Introduction, p. 21.

² Cf. for instance, his remarks at the beginning of *paṭalas* xiii and xvi.

³ Cf. his remarks at the beginning of *paṭala* ii.

⁴ Cf. his Ath. Prāt., p. 580 (top). Cf. also Burnell, *On the Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians*, pp. 83-4.

restricts itself to remarks which are concerned only with the first part, showing thereby that the later parts of the Prātiśākhya had no place in the original scheme of the work.

In view of these general remarks the eighteen *paṭalas* of the R̥g-Veda-prātiśākhya can at first be divided into three parts: (i) *paṭalas* i–xii, (2) xiii–xv, and (3) xvi–xviii. The third part, comprising *paṭalas* xvi–xviii, is quite independent of the first two parts, and in fact, as Prof. Regnier says, forms by itself a treatise on metre, the treatment of which is not an essential feature of a Prātiśākhya, as can be judged by its being confined to our own Prātiśākhya, while the other Prātiśākhyas are completely silent about it. There are other facts which prove that, in all probability, this part is a later addition to the Prātiśākhya. While viii. 40 recommends that in Pādas short by one or more syllables the required number of syllables should be restored by means of a resolution (ब्रूह) of coalesced combinations and semivowels, in xvii. 22 and 23 a distinction is made between the two cases. Resolution (ब्रूह)¹ is recommended only in the case of coalesced combinations, while for semivowels, intervention of a corresponding vowel (cf. व्येयात्सटुग्नेः स्वरिः) is prescribed.² Both these passages being integral parts in their respective places, the contradiction involved in them proves the diversity of their authorship. Moreover, the rule viii. 40 was quite superfluous if both the parts were by the same author. The independent character of the last part as well as its later date of composition is further proved by the fact that Sūtras 32–40 of *paṭala* xviii are either merely a repetition of or implied in Sūtras 19–26 and 37 of *paṭala* i, while stanzas 30, 31 of the former *paṭala* (xviii) are merely a verbal repetition of stanzas 14 and 15 of *paṭala* xv where their occurrence is more natural than in *paṭala* xviii. It is, perhaps, of interest to note that the use of the expletive particle ह is peculiar to this last part. The use of the preposition अधि with the ablative in the third part is in a slightly different sense from that in the first two parts.

The second part, comprising *paṭalas* xiii–xv, is lacking in that independent character which is found in the third part. Though *paṭala* xiii is a sort of collection of miscellaneous matter, and is not so uniform in character as *paṭala* xiv, which is wholly devoted to the description of various faults in pronunciation, both are, in their colophons in some MSS., and also by Uvaṭa,³ called Śikṣā-paṭalas, and the conclusion of *paṭala* xiv is applicable to both of them. *Paṭala* xv, which describes

¹ As प्रेता can be resolved into प्र हता; cf. Uvaṭa.

² So that व्यम्बकम् can be read as चियम्बकम्; cf. Uvaṭa.

³ Cf. the Com. on xiii. 22 (अनयोः शिक्षापटलयोः &c.).

the mode of instruction followed in teaching the recitation of the R̥gveda, is called **स्वाध्यायपटल** in its colophon in C⁴, or **ब्रह्मचारीपटल** in W. Uvaṭa¹ once refers to it as **ओंकारपटल**. Though not called **शिषापटल** the latter *patala* may be considered a continuation of the two former, and can thus be grouped together with them as forming a part distinct from both the other parts.

This part, however, is not quite independent of the first part, and is rather a sort of complement to the same. This is proved by the fact that there are passages in the second part which clearly refer to the first part; cf. **तेषां स्थानं प्रति नादात्तदुक्तम्** (xiii. 7) which refers to **नादः परोऽभिनिधानाच्चुवं तत्तत्कालस्थानम्** (vi. 39), cf. also xiv. 1 where **सांहितो यश्चधर्मः** clearly refers to the first part. Moreover, in one case it would appear that the description of the *karanas* in xiii. 8-12 is something which is taken for granted in the first part; cf. vi. 27. In spite of all these facts which might suggest the unity of the second part with the first, there are arguments which go to prove a later date of this part. According to the first part (iv. 82) the nasal sound after *ā* in the word **मांश्चले** is Anunāsika, but in the second part (xiii. 27) it is distinctly stated to be Anusvāra. Uvaṭa tries to reconcile this contradiction by saying: **शाखान्तरे किल मांश्चले इति सानुस्वारं पठन्ति । तत्पदश्चेति ।** (xiii. 27). But it is obvious that one and the same person cannot be responsible for these contradictory views. Moreover, while according to the first part (i. 10) Anusvāra is included in the breathings (**ऊष्माणः**), we find it, in the second part (xiii. 11), excluded from the same. The complementary nature, as well as a later date of these *patalas*, is further illustrated by the fact that while in the earlier chapters the Prātisākhya professedly (cf. ii. 1) deals with the constitution of the Sāmhītā-text on the basis of the Pada-text, which is taken for granted, we find in the second part matters dealt with which are exclusively concerned with the Pada-text; cf. xiii. 30. Though there are a few similar cases in the early chapters (cf. ii. 13; iv. 81-2), they are mentioned there incidentally, or only for the sake of illustration of some term. Moreover, it is also noteworthy that the term **समापाद्यानि** is explained (xiii. 31) after its use in the preceding Sūtra. A similar case is not found in the earlier chapters; though rather doubtful, but very interesting, proof for a later date of this second part, is offered by the following fact. *Nāsikya* is described as a regular nose-sound in i. 47-8. Though the word is never again used in the same sense in the R̥g-Vedaprātisākhya, and there is no rule there respecting its occurrence, we know from Uvaṭa, as well

¹ Cf. the Com. on xviii. 58 (**इत्युक्तौ ओंकारोऽंकारपटले**).

as from a comparison of the other Prātisākhya (cf. Ath. Prāt. i. 100; Tait. Prāt. xxi. 14; Vāj. Prāt. i. 74, 80; viii. 28) that most probably it means a transitional nose-sound which is heard after *h* before a nasal mute in such words as ब्रह्म. In the commentary on Vāj. Prāt. viii. 28 Uvaṭa says: अयम् (i.e. ऊँ or नासिक्य) ऋक्शाखायां प्रसिद्धः । In the fourteenth *paṭala* of the Rġ-Vedaprātisākhya, however, it appears to me that the same nose-sound is described as a fault in pronunciation (xiv. 35). If my identification of the *nāsikya* in the first *paṭala* with this nose-sound in the fourteenth *paṭala* is correct, the contradiction between the two *paṭalas* is obvious, and can be explained only by assuming the diversity of their authorship. The enumeration of the *upasargas* in xv. 17, though they are already given in xii. 20, is also worth noticing in this respect.

The main reason which has prompted me to divide the first part after *paṭala* xii, and not to include the latter *paṭala*, which is also a sort of complement, in the second part, is that in some MSS. (B³ and W), in its colophon, that *paṭala* is called सीमापटल. That this name of the *paṭala* is very old is proved by the fact that Uvaṭa, in the commentary on ii. 1, says: संहिता पदप्रवृत्तिरिथेतदधिष्ठितं वेदितव्यमा सीमापटलात् । To me it appears that this name सीमापटल indicates clearly that at one time that *paṭala* (xii) was regarded as the last *paṭala* of the Prātisākhya.

Owing to reasons already shown the first part as a whole is, in all probability, earlier in date than the two latter parts. This does not mean that the whole of the former is necessarily by the same author or of the same date. On the contrary, there are traces to be found which show that, at least, *paṭalas* xii and xi are later in date than the other *paṭalas* of the first part. The arguments as to the later date of *paṭala* xii are only tentative, and not definitive. Of the nine stanzas of this *paṭala*, the first four are applicable only to the Pada-text, and this fact is clearly stated by the author himself; cf. Sūtra 16: ऋक्पदेष्विदम् । Stanzas 5 and 6 are of a general nature, while stanza 7 is really out of place in this Prātisākhya, because nowhere else does the Prātisākhya concern itself with the accent of particular words. The last two stanzas have already been shown to be probable interpolations.

There are stronger and more definite reasons with regard to the later date of *paṭala* xi. It can be proved by a comparison of the contents of this *paṭala* with those of *paṭala* x, that the former is a sort of commentary on the latter.¹ A large portion of *paṭala* xi is obviously concerned with assigning reasons for some rules of *paṭala* x. On the other hand, many of the rules of *paṭala* xi are mere repetitions of those of

¹ Cf. Regnier's Rġ-Vedaprātisākhya, part ii, p. 56.

paṭala x, there being no justification at all for their repetition ; cf. x. 12-14 and xi. 28-30. It seems that the author of *paṭala* xi accepted also some other opinions which are not found in *paṭala* x ; cf. xi. 33, 45. We arrive at the same conclusion by a comparison of vocabulary, style, and metre of this *paṭala* with those of the rest of the first part, or even of the whole of the *Prātiśākhya*. The word गुण appears for the first time, in xi. 10, in the same sense as in Pāṇini (cf. Uvaṭa). दोष (xi. 47) is used in the sense of विकार. The words अद्वियोनि (xi. 2), आगम (xi. 10), अनार्थविलोप (xi. 58), are also noteworthy. The style generally of the whole *paṭala*, specially of the last four stanzas, is argumentative, and seems to be more modern than that of the whole of the rest of the *Prātiśākhya*. The exceptional character of this *paṭala*, as regards metre, has been already shown. All this shows a later date of this *paṭala* than that of the first ten *paṭalas*, and possibly of the other parts too, of the *Prātiśākhya*.

There is no reason to question the unity of the first ten *paṭalas*. The opinion of Prof. Whitney,¹ as far as *paṭala* x is concerned, that the part of the Ṛg-Vedaprātiśākhya which concerns the construction of the *krama*-text is open to the suspicion of being a later accretion to the text, is contradicted by the fact that *krama* is mentioned in i. 62 (ऋते नतोपाचरित-क्रमस्वरान्), showing thereby that it must have formed a part in the original scheme of the work.

¹ Cf. his *Ath. Prāt.*, p. 577 (*J. A. O. S.*, 1862).

